

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

In the Official Action dated October 15, 2004, which has been made FINAL, the Examiner first rejected Claims 1, 5-7, 10, 11, 15, 17, 18 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Lieberman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2002/0075240) (hereinafter "Lieberman") in view of Goldman (U.S. Patent No. 6,232,960) (hereinafter "Goldman"), and further rejected Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raffi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,614,422) (hereinafter "Raffi") in view of Goldman. Claims 4, 8 and 19 still stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Lieberman in view of Goldman as applied to rejected Claims 1, 5-7, 10, 11, 15, 17, 18 and 21 above, and further in view of Hillman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2002/0061217) (hereinafter "Hillman"). The Examiner further rejected Claims 9 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Lieberman in Goldman as applied to rejected Claims 1, 5-7, 10, 11, 15, 17, 18 and 21 above, and in further view of Torunoglu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2003/00132921) (hereinafter "Torunoglu"). Further Claim 22 remains rejected as unpatentable over Lieberman and Goldman as applied above, in further view of Sandbach (U.S. Patent No. 2003/0011576); and Claims 23 and 24 stand rejected as unpatentable over Lieberman and Goldman as applied above, in further view of Raffi.

With respect to the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1, 5-7, 10, 11, 15, 17, 18 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being anticipated by Lieberman in view of Goldman, applicants respectfully disagree in view of the amendments provided herein to Claims 1 and 15.

Independent Claims 1 and 15 have been amended to set forth a further element comprising:

mechanism for arming a key location prior to registering a keystroke corresponding to that selected key location. This mechanism has been added to set forth the important step of preventing unwarranted or unintended keystroke registrations. For example, as described in the specification at page 15, lines 4-10 which describes how virtual keys may be armed for registration as part of the initialization process prior to using the virtual keyboard. Thus, for example, the spacebar can serve such an arming function. Before the keyboard is armed, the user may rest his/her fingers on the virtual keys without registration, or, move his/her fingers and successfully touch any key except the armed key with no effect.

Respectfully, neither the Lieberman nor Goldman references relied upon as providing the basis for the obviousness rejection teach or suggest the computer device (as claimed in Claim 1) and method of providing input to a computer device (as claimed in Claim 15) that includes the additional step/mechanism for arming a selected key location prior to registering a keystroke corresponding to that selected key location in order to prevent unwarranted or unintended keystroke registrations.

With respect to the rejection of Claim 12, the Examiner has relied upon the combination of Raffi and Goldman. However, these references also do not teach nor suggest, the computer device of the invention that comprises: a projecting device for displaying one of: a screen image or portion of a screen image display, the screen image including displayed items capable of being selected by an object; a mechanism for arming a selected item location prior to registering an object as being detected at that selected item location; a signal detection system for detecting the presence of an object located at a selected item location, the signal detection system comprising a radar device adapted for detecting objects at locations within a limited range defined by the

screen image or screen image portion; and, a mechanism for determining the selected item in response to detecting an object at a corresponding selected armed item location.

While Raffi speaks to the prevention of registering unintended key entry by a user, it provides a solution, not by arming a selected item location prior to registering an object detected at the item location (as in the present invention), but rather by intelligently monitoring movement of a user's fingers. That is, the teaching in Raffi at col. 18, lines 50-62 teaches a purely software solution that provides means calibrated to detect only intentional gestures for treatment as valid key entries. It is respectfully submitted that such a solution for preventing unintended key entries as taught in Raffi is not the same as the arming function provided in the present invention, whereby a user may make an "intentional gesture" which would otherwise be detectable and registered as a legitimate key entry as taught in Raffi, yet, in the present invention would not be "registered", unless the item/key location has been previously armed according to the invention as now set forth in Claim 12.

In sum, with respect to the rejections of independent Claims 1, 12 and 15, neither the Lieberman/Goldman or Raffi/Goldman references teach the claimed recitation of arming a selected key location prior to registering a keystroke corresponding to that selected key location, i.e., a computer device and data input system therefore that prevents unwarranted or unintentional keystroke entries by first requiring a positive arming action prior to selecting the key. That is, neither the Lieberman/Goldman or Raffi/Goldman provides a teaching of first activating/deactivating portions of the keyboard, e.g., arming one or more virtual keys for registration as part of the initialization process prior to using the virtual keyboard. This facilitates a user being able to move his/her fingers and successfully touch a disarmed key(s) without registering the stroke as supported in the present specification at page 15 lines 4-10.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of amended independent Claims 1 and 15 as being obvious over Lieberman in view of Goldman, and further withdraw the rejection of independent Claim 12 as being obvious over Raffi in view of Goldman. Further, applicants request that all claims dependent upon amended Claims 1 and 15 be allowed as dependent upon an allowed base claims as amended.

Respectfully, it is requested that this amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 be entered as Examiner has made the instant obviousness rejections of Claim 1, 5-7, 10, 11, 15, 17, 18 and 21 for the first time in this Final Rejection. Thus, applicants did not have a prior opportunity to respond to the alleged obviousness rejection issues, as indicated for the first time in the present Office Action.

In view of the foregoing remarks herein, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance be issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with the Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned, Applicants' attorney, at the following telephone number: (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven Fischman  
Registration No. 34,594

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser  
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343

SF:gc